SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF AMENDED BILL

Franc	hica	Tav	Roard	4
Franc	nise	IAX	DOME	1

Franchise Tax Board					
Author: Alquist & Cunneen	Analyst: Kristina North	Bill Number: AB 2			
See previous Related Bills: analyses	Telephone: 845-6978	Amended Date: August 16, 1999			
	Attorney: Patrick Kusiak	Sponsor:			
SUBJECT: Exclusion/Educational Courses					
DEPARTMENT AMENDMENTS ACCEPTED. Amendments reflect suggestions of previous analysis of bill as introduced/amended					
AMENDMENTS IMPACT REVENUE. A new revenue estimate is provided.					
AMENDMENTS DID NOT RESOLVE THE DEPARTMENT'S CONCERNS stated in the previous analysis of bill as introduced/amended					
FURTHER AMENDMENTS NECESSARY.					
DEPARTMENT POSITION CHANGED TO					
REMAINDER OF PREVIOUS ANALYSIS OF BILL AS INTRODUCED <u>December 7, 1998</u> and AMENDED <u>April 21, June 1 and June 28, STILL APPLY.</u>					
X OTHER - See comments below.					
CIDMADY OF DILL					
SUMMARY OF BILL					
Under the Personal Income Tax I from gross income the amount the the employee to take graduate I medical or other advanced acade July 1, 1999, and on or before	nat an employer pays or i evel courses in pursuit emic or professional degr	incurs, up to \$2,625, for of a law, business,			
The Franchise Tax Board (FTB) v Legislature the number and amou are available.					
SUMMARY OF AMENDMENT					
The July 13, 1999, amendments of the department's analysis of the requirement for the FTB to annuamount of exclusions claimed. FTB provide the report to the experiment of the experiment to the experiment.	ne bill as amended June 2 nally report to the Legis The August 16, 1999, ame	28, 1999, and adds a slature the number and endment specifies that the			
Except for the above discussion remainder of the department's a 1998, and as amended April 21, Board position is restated for	nalyses of the bill as i June 1, and June 28, 199	introduced December 7,			
POLICY CONSIDERATIONS					
Since this bill would create a taxpayers who receive employer required to file a form 540 sta	assistance for graduate	level courses would be			
Board Position:	NP NAR PENDING	Department/Legislative Director Date			
		Geoff Way for J. Rosas 9/10/1999			

C:\WINDOWS\TEMP\AB 2 08-16-99 SA9F.DOC 09/27/99 12:37 PM

Assembly Bill 2 (Alquist) Amended August 16, 1999 Page 2

difference. Thus, these taxpayers would be unable to file the simpler forms 540EZand 540A. However, a potential for such difference exists even if this bill is not enacted since pending federal legislation (H.R. 323 and S. 211) would permanently extend the federal educational assistance exclusion and expand the exclusion to include graduate level courses. The maximum amount of federal exclusion for graduate level courses would be \$5,250 while this bill would provide an exclusion up to \$2,625 for graduate level courses.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Unlike credits and deductions, exclusions are not generally reflected on the state income tax return; thus, the information necessary for FTB to prepare the report required by this bill as it relates to the existing exclusion for education is not available. However, the difference between the state and federal exclusion amount created by this bill would be reflected on the employee's W-2, and affected taxpayers would account for this difference by making an adjustment on the Schedule CA, which accompanies the 540. To prepare the report required by this bill, the department would manually capture the amount of the graduate level exclusion by reviewing each return. As the department does not currently capture separate Schedule CA items, this would increase processing time and costs.

DEPARTMENTAL COSTS

Total departmental costs to implement this bill are estimated to be \$226,000 for 2000/2001 and \$151,000 ongoing costs. The costs would be primarily attributable to forms changes, additional processing costs, potential taxpayer questions and taxpayer errors related to the new request for information regarding undergraduate and graduate level educational assistance.

BOARD POSITION

Support.

At its meeting of March 23, 1999, the Franchise Tax Board voted 2-0 to take a support position on this bill as introduced December 7, 1998.